UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/762,472	03/29/2001	Michael Eder	449122002000	4686

7590   12/02/2005

Morrison & Foerster
2000 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20006-1888

EXAMINER
ZHEN, LI B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action *Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief*	09/762,472	EDER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Li B. Zhen	2194	

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

THE REPLY FILED <u>09 November 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

   a) ☒ The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u>

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

<u>AMENDMENTS</u>

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because

   (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

   (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u>.

   Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u>.

   Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-11</u>.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>none</u>.

<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

<u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u>

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

13. ☐ Other: _____.

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

2

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

In response to the Final Office Action dated 08/09/2005, applicant argues that (1) Hoffpauir does not disclose an exchange process for applications or protocols between two subscribers via a network [p.2, lines 13 - 21] and (2) Hoffpauir does not teach or suggest the exchange of applications or protocols between two subscribers via a network [p. 2, lines 24 - 25]

As to argument (1), examiner notes that the claims do not recite an exchange process for applications or protocols between two subscribers. Instead, the claims recite a first application for signaling for a first subscriber and a second application for call processing between the first subscriber and second subscriber. Hoffpauir teaches a first application for signal processing [col. 13, lines 35 - 60 and col. 6, lines 4 - 18] and a second application for call processing between the first subscriber and second subscriber [call processing application 54; col. 14, lines 37 - 57; col. 13, lines 55 - 60; col. 14, line 58 - col. 15, line 2]. The call processing application performs call processing between any two subscribers [i.e. mobile subscribers with others outside of the traditional wireless telecommunications systems; col. 6, lines 4 - 18]. Although, Hoffpauir teaches using the first and second applications for signaling and call processing between any two subscribers, the claims do not require a dedicated first signaling application for each subscriber or a dedicated call processing application for each pair of subscribers.

As to argument (2), examiner respectfully notes that the claims do not recite the feature of "exchange of applications or protocols between two subscribers via a network". Examiner notes that the claims recite exchanging call and signaling data and not exchanging applications or protocols.